DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 356 TM 019 140

AUTHOR	Fuentes, Edward J.; Stratoudakis, Carol Jay
TITLE	Public Response to the 1991 Goals Report. Outreach Report to the National Education Goals Panel.
INSTITUTION	National Education Goals Panel, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	92-04
PUB DATE	15 Jun 92
NOTE	37p.; For a related document, see ED 334 280.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Advisory Committees; Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Feedback; Information Dissemination; Legislators; *Mass Media; Mass Media Role; *Public Opinion; Reports; Researchers; *Responses; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Goals 1990; National Education Goals Panel

ABSTRACT

This document summarizes the media's reaction to the release of the 1991 "National Education Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners," and public response to the National Education Goals Panel's (NEGP's) call for specific feedback on its work. Results will be used by the NEGP to improve the format and content of future reports. Reactions of public figures and the media were varied, but it was clear that the report had focused attention on the nation's need for educational change. In November 1991, a public outreach effort was conducted to accompany the dissemination of the report as readers were invited to forward their reactions to the NEGP. A targeted effort was directed at constituency groups of administrators, legislators, and educational researchers. Seventy-four written reviews of the goals report were received. Because of the diversity of replies, a simple tally of responses could not be made. A consensus was that the report format was clear and concise. In general, the report's content was praised for its presentation of diverse and important data. Specific feedback is highlighted, and recommendations for improving future Goals reports are listed. Appendix A lists 65 press articles about the report, and Appendix B contains acknowledgments of contributors. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350356

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1991 GOALS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Outreach Report to the National Education Goals Panel

Edward J. Fuentes
Senior Research Associate

Carol Jay Stratoudakis, Ph.D.
Staff Consultant

June 15, 1992

92-04

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL MEMBERS

GOVERNORS

Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., South Carolina, Chairman (1991–1992)
John Ashcroft, Missouri
Evan Bayh, Indiana
Terry Branstad, Iowa
Howard Dean, Vermont
Benjamin Nelson, Nebraska
Barbara Roberts, Oregon
Roy Romer, Colorado, Past Chairman (1990–1991)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Lamar Alexander, Secretary of Education
Roger B. Porter, Assistant to the President for Economic and Domestic Policy

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Representative Dale Kildee, Michigan
Representative William Goodling, Pennsylvania
Senator Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico
Senator Thad Cochran, Mississippi

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Wilmer S. Cody

Public Response to the 1991 Goals Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Media Response to the Goals Report 2

Targeted Outreach 9

- Feedback on the Goals Report 10
- Report Format 10
- Report Content 10
- Feedback on the Federal Role Chapter 12

Suggestions for Improving Future Goals Reports 13

- Report Format Suggestions 13
- Report Content Suggestions 13
- Federal Role Chapter Suggestions 16
- Other Suggestions 18

Appendix A: Press Articles 19

Appendix B: Acknowledgments 27

- Organizations 27
- Individuals 33

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1991 NATIONAL GOALS REPORT: BUILDING A NATION OF LEARNERS

INTRODUCTION

On September 30, on the anniversary of the Charlottesville Education Summit, the 1991 National Goals Report was issued at a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. attended by over 100 print and television reporters and a host of educational organization and association representatives. Colorado Governor Roy Romer, 1991 Panel Chair, and the members of the Panel offered the American public their views and insights into the development of the Report and its meaning for the nation.

Concurrent with the press conference, a press release was sent to over 2,000 media points announcing the National Education Goals Report and its major findings. National television stations and their local affiliates aired the story on their news programs. As a result, the Goals Report was the subject of discussion on a number of network talk shows. Numerous newspaper articles and editorials on the Report also appeared across the country. Many quoted the reactions of education leaders to the Report and its findings.

For a time, the Panel and its Report were big news, but the Panel's work must have a longer life than the news media generally gives a story. To exert continuing influence and produce the desired effect, the Report must make a lasting impact on the way this nation views and approaches its educational future. For this to happen, the Panel's annual Reports must provide direction and a unifying theme, and be responsive to the perceived long-term needs of diverse education and public policy constituencies. One of the ways in which the Panel can work toward these goals is to listen carefully to the primary users of its Report.

This document summarizes the media's reaction to the release of the 1991 *National Education Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners*, and public response to the Panel's call for specific feedback on its work. The results of this effort will be used by the Goals Panel to improve both the format and content of future Reports so that they better meet the educational information needs of the nation.

MEDIA RESPONSE TO THE GOALS REPORT RELEASE

Newspapers all across the nation covered the Goals Report release. Through the media, many public figures and education experts expressed their opinions in stories on the Goals Report. Editorial writers and television reporters also weighed in with their responses to the Panel's work. The reactions ran the gamut from those who believed that the Report was just another piece of bad news that added little to the debate, to those who hailed the Panel's work as a long overdue call to action.

Often the reactions of public figures were predictable, given their earlier stances on education issues. At other times, the responses were couched in terms that went beyond the interests of the respondent's traditional audience. Whatever the reaction, it is clear that the Report focused attention on the nation's reduced educational status and the need for change. Clearly, the message that "business as usual will not do" was delivered.

The following is a sampling of the media coverage for the month following the Report's release. (See Appendix A for a more extensive listing of newspaper articles and headlines). The television program/publication, date, reporter/writer, and pertinent quotes are cited as well as summaries of editorial opinion.

ABC News
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Peter Jennings

> "One of the reasons for establishing world-class standards for education is that many Americans have a rather old-fashioned, outmoded view of how their schools are doing. You hear it often -- 'My school's okay, it's all those others in trouble.' Well, today's report card finally makes it clear that there are problems everywhere."

Austin American-Statesman
October 1, 1991
Editorial

> The current system of education in this country isn't working.

Baltimore Sun
October 3, 1991
Editorial

> While the latest Report cited a number of areas where statistics are inadequate . . . change can begin before such statistics are developed. We've had enough "wake-up calls."

CNN
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Frank Sesno

> The Report is a "crash course to assess and improve the nation's classrooms."

Reported by: Deborah Potter

> While this "is not the first time American schools have been found wanting," the new reports "do provide the clearest measure yet of just how far American education has to go to measure up."

Christian Science Monitor
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Clara Germani

> This first report card and the setting of NAEP's achievement standards are unprecedented for creating consistent national education standards and mark progress in measuring effects of the education reform movement, say education authorities.

Education Daily
October 4, 1991
Anonymous

> The Report is important not only for its comprehensive inventory of education-related data, but for the information it didn't include, such as state-by-state rankings and scores from college entrance examinations. Such rankings have politicized the debate by pitting states and schools against each other.

> ***Susan Fuhrman, Director***
> ***Consortium for Policy Research in Education,***
> ***Rutgers State University, New Jersey***

The Report helps clarify the status of American education. "The Report, I think, helps to sort some of that out and to focus on those issues that are critical."

Milton Morris, Vice-President of Research
The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, Washington, D.C.

October 30, 1991
Anonymous

Special educators displayed their displeasure. "We are not part of the reform as articulated in this and other Reports. As the rhetoric increases, children with special needs need to be included. If that does not happen, we will not be part of the vision."

Ingrid Draper, Executive Director
Detroit Public Schools, Office of Special Education

Many disabled students will never meet the goals, even if they successfully complete their individual education programs. "The kid that is now working at McDonald's is as valuable as the kid who learned physics."

Fred Weintraub, Assistant Executive Director Council for Exceptional Children

Education Week
October 9, 1991
Reported by: Lynn Olson & Robert Rothman

"Politics has clearly influenced the section on the federal government. They include absolutely everything in the kitchen sink to get a $59 billion total."

Gordon Ambach, Executive Director
Council of Chief State School Officers

"The work of identifying what needs to be collected for the future was probably the most important work of all. What this does is to provide both a framework and a mandate to move data-collection activity."

Christopher Cross, Executive Director
The Business Roundtable

"Goals are a good thing, but the real question for the United States is how to meet the goals. And the question of how to meet them is not illustrated here."

Patricia Albjerg Graham, President
The Spencer Foundation

The Panel's criticism of student performance ignored the improvements that have occurred over the past decade.

William Honig, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California

"This document seems primarily designed to reassure the country about whether the Bush administration has an adequate education agenda. In truth, the federal government is making a smaller contribution to education today than it did a decade ago."

Edward Kennedy, U.S. Senator

"Maybe the reform movement didn't do a damn thing, but to rely heavily on international comparisons before policy changes, and to assume there were no changes, are pretty heroic assumptions."

Michael Kirst, Stanford University

"I think that we're going to look back on this report card as, 'that wasn't a Model-T, that was a horse-and-buggy.' But [it's] a start."

Frank Newman, President
The Education Commission of the States

"These numbers, which are designed to portray the overwhelming majority of our students as mathematically illiterate, are technically indefensible and grossly misleading.

[Using them in the document cast] some outrageous stains on the integrity of this Report."

Albert Shanker, President
American Federation of Teachers

MacNeil/Lehrer
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Judy Woodruff

"The state of the US educational system may be improving, but reports out today say much more progress is needed for the country to remain competitive."

NBC News
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Tom Brokaw

There is "a long way to go toward meeting the education goals."

Reported by: Bob Kurr

The correlation between family structure and student performance makes the news "as much about sociology as scholarship."

New York Daily News
October 7, 1991
Editorial

State legislators should be formally involved in the Panel. These are the people who control much of the funding for school districts. Their expertise and political support must be solicited.

The Report does not acknowledge the significance of racial divisions. The Panel should take a hard look at why -- and consider how resources can be deployed so that schools in need get help, whatever the students' race or the parents' income.

Rocky Mountain News
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Katie Kerwin

"It's the same news -- we're not doing very well. There must

be a warehouse in Washington somewhere that is filled with all the reports that have been done in the 20 years documenting this and we still keep throwing words at it."

Patricia Schroeder, U.S. Representative

St. Louis Dispatch
October 3, 1991
Editorial

The current fashion of setting goals, then devising and administering tests to find how students measure up, can only go so far. At some point, politicians will have to stop testing and talking. They must start giving schools the tools they need to do a better job: smaller classes, adequate buildings and equipment and more support for teachers, both moral and financial, so the best and the brightest will make education their career.

USA Today
October 1, 1991
Reported by: Wendy Benedetto

"I don't need any kind of assessment to tell me how we need to get children ready for school. I think everybody knows that a child who hasn't been fed breakfast is going to have a tough time."

The Goals Panel is on the right track, but should pay more attention to Goal 1 and Goal 6.

Keith Geiger, President
National Education Association

Washington Post
October 1, 1991
Reported by: K.J. Cooper

"They're so anxious to add up federal aid expenditures that advanced flight training for Navy aviators is included . . ."

Edward Kennedy, U.S. Senator

Washington Times
October 1, 1991
Editorial

> "The bad news is that if their calculator batteries ever run down, today's students are in big trouble . . . The cold fact is that the top students of today are not doing as well as the top students of 20 years ago."

October 12, 1991
Reported by: Leonard Larsen

> The first goal ought to read "ready to learn in a disciplined environment."

TARGETED OUTREACH

In November 1991, a public outreach effort was conducted to accompany the dissemination of the Goals Report. Readers of the Report were invited to forward their reactions to the Goals Panel. This general solicitation was complemented by a targeted effort to obtain written comments from the following constituency groups:

- Governors (including trust territories & commonwealths);
- Chief State School Officers;
- State Higher Education Executive Officers;
- Federally funded Regional Education Laboratory and Center Directors;
- Selected State and Federal Agency Heads;
- National Education Association/Organization Heads; and
- National Council of State Legislatures.

A packet was sent to each of the 744 members from these targeted groups. Each packet contained a letter from the Interim Executive Director of the Goals Panel soliciting reactions to the Goals Report, a copy of the Report itself, a copy of the Report's Executive Summary, and a Report Review Form on which to record reactions to the Report.

After a number of weeks, follow-up telephone calls were made to 35 of the initially contacted association/organization heads to further encourage their feedback. Because these associations/organizations represent broad constituency groups (such as parents, teachers, school administrators, higher education associations, and businesses), their feedback was especially valued. Many of the responses compiled by Panel staff were received from these 35 individuals.

The result of these efforts are 74 written reviews of the Goals Report from the principals of various associations, organizations, government agencies, etc. (See Appendix B for a listing of all reviewers.) Most of the respondents used the Review Form supplied by the Goals Panel staff; some responded by letter.

Chapter Three of the Report, "The Federal Role in Meeting the National Education Goals," was unique because it did not address any specific Goal. Rather, it described the federal contribution to activities associated with the six National Goals within the preschool, school, and the post-high school years. Although reviewers of the Goals Report could, and

did, comment on all sections of the Report, the Goals Panel was interested in soliciting specific feedback on the Federal Role chapter because of the singularity of this section. Thus, 33 individuals whose expertise was particularly pertinent for review of the Federal Role were sent reprints of chapter three and asked to fill out and return a Federal Role Review Form which simply asked for their "comments." Seven of the 33 responded.

Feedback on the Goals Report

The Feedback Form used to collect input on the Goals Report asked individuals their opinions of both the Report's format and its content. Although most of the 74 respondents followed these instructions, many chose to respond in a more free-form manner. Moreover, most reviewers either specified or implied suggestions for improving future Goals Reports. As a result, a simple tally of remarks could not be made. Rather, judgement and analytical skill had to be brought to bear in order to transform the feedback into a coherent body of data. The following is the result of that effort.

Report Format

The general consensus is that the Report provides a clear and concise presentation of the data in a usable format. Half of the reviewers considered the Report well organized and readable. One reviewer described the Report as "user friendly." Reviewers mentioned that the graphics with blocks and tables easily conveyed information, and the layout was described as "easy on the eye." The "what we know" and "what we don't know" sections in each goal section were also appreciated for the manner in which they clarified the issues. Part III of the Report on state indicators was described as informative and helpful. Appendix A of the Report was referred to as a convenient listing of data sources.

On the other hand, three reviewers stated that the separation of the Report into two sections is both cumbersome and confusing, while another reviewer felt that the full text of the Goals and their objectives should not have been relegated to an appendix. There was also some criticism that there was too much information on a given page. One reviewer pointed out that some tables included nonstandardized change scores.

Report Content

In general, the Goals Report's content was praised for its presentation of diverse and important data. Ten reviewers found the Report's indicators and content generally appropriate and a definite improvement over previous efforts to describe the status of education in this country. The writing was described as clear and concise. Reveiwers thought that the Report

also gave an accurate indication of what we know and don't know about the nation's progress toward the goals. The positive slant of the Report was also appreciated, e.g., the reporting of the number of school completers rather than the number of school dropouts. In addition, the Report was commended for drawing on such a wide array of data sources and for dealing effectively with the underlying problems of the preschool, primary school, and high school levels. Overall, most reviewers considered the content of the Report to be of value.

Criticism of the Report was more specific than the overall judgement that it was a valuable, well-written, and needed informational digest. It often sprang from the choice of data and the Panel's decision to make the Report as straightforward and brief as possible. For example, the use of the NAGB proficiency levels came under attack by three reviewers. The controversy surrounding their development was cited as proof that the levels lack credibility. While one reviewer felt that the NAGB levels should not have been used under any circumstances, another believed that describing the arguments both for and against the levels would have been sufficient to set the context for these data.

In the same vein, the inclusion of international math/science comparisons also was criticized. One reviewer believed that the data were too old to be of much value. Another stated that the data are less than ideal on a number of technical points and believed that the controversy surrounding the data should have been made explicit in the Report's text and that the reader should have been provided with more background.

Other reviewers focused on particular goals. There was a lot of input on the perceived shortcomings of the Goal 1 write-up. Umbrage was taken with the inclusion of the "parent-child cultural outings" indicator because it allegedly reflects a white-majority, middle-class bias of child rearing. Moreover, the "preschool quality" indicator also was described as misleading, since the data are based on acceptable rather than optimal teacher/child ratios with the result that preschool programs appear to be better than they are. A similar argument was made against the citation of teacher preparation figures which seem to equate teachers who have taken a single early childhood class with those who hold college degrees in the subject. The lack of group size or child/teacher ratios for classes for toddlers and infants was also criticized.

Finally, under Goal 3, a single criticism was received for the Report's failure to break down national and state data by gender. A couple of reviewers noted that there was little on the preparation of students as productive workers.

Feedback on the Federal Role Chapter

Seven reviewers responded to the Goals Panel's call for feedback on the Federal Role chapter. In general, their responses reflected an appreciation for both the thoroughness and the importance of the information included in the chapter. Reviewers felt that the Federal Role chapter was well-written and contained a great deal of useful information. One reviewer stated that such information had "never before (been) gathered so compactly in one place." Another likened the chapter to an almanac or statistical digest.

Although reviewers had several specific suggestions for improving the chapter, all valued it for what it was -- a first attempt to meld available federal fiscal information related to the goals into a coherent whole. In this vein, the reviewers' comments were given as recommendations rather than condemnations of the Panel's efforts.

Reviewers observed that the federal role is actually broader than that highlighted in the chapter. There is a judicial role, a tax role, and a civil rights role that the federal government must play. The chapter's focus on federal financial contributions does not take into account the many policy contributions of the federal government. One suggestion was to expand the background information in the chapter to at least acknowledge other roles.

Reviewers repeatedly recommended that the chapter report resource allocations by Goal, despite the Report's explicit caveat that this could not be done with available information. The six Goals were considered by reviewers to be a more useful way to organize resource allocation information than the three levels used in the Report.

Additionally, a suggestion was made to use budget outlays, rather than budget authority figures, because they more accurately reflect the federal contribution to education. Moreover, some reviewers believed that the data would be more meaningful if eligibility and coverage information were also provided. It was suggested that more information on local and state contributions to education should also be included to give more "context" to the chapter. One reviewer stated, ". . . change the focus of the chapter from merely looking at what the federal government is doing to one that looks at goal attainment from a 'federalist system' perspective" -- i.e., include all contributing partners.

Finally, reviewers noted what was not included in the chapter and asked, why not? Why not mention legislative efforts to increase flexibility in federal education programs? Why not use defining data points prior to 1989? Why not report on outcome information, where available? Why not list the federal mandates that effect state and local education funding? Why not identify the source (legislative or policy) of substantial budget changes?

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING FUTURE GOALS REPORTS

Abstracts of suggestions received for improving the Goals Report appear below:

Report Format Suggestions

- Eliminate the two-part format. It is confusing and cumbersome.

  Christopher Cross, The Business Roundtable
  Nancy Bunnett, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
  Tom Shannon, National School Boards Association

- Place the Goals and their objectives *together* in the main body of the Report.

  Ernest N. Mannino, U.S. Department of State

- Change the binding of the Report to a loose-leaf format to allow chapters to be readily reproduced.

  Charles E. Smith, Tennessee Department of Education

Report Content Suggestions

- Provide more data context to avoid misinterpretation and to better delineate both where we are and why we got there. Consider demographic data.

  Herb Salinger, American Association of School Personnel Administrators
  Charles E. Smith, Tennessee Department of Education
  Tom Shannon, National School Boards Association
  Debra DeLee, National Education Association
  Andrew Weiszman, Chicago, Illinois

- The controversy surrounding the development of the National Assessment Governing Board achievement levels should be explicitly stated and discussed in the body of the Report.

  James W. Keefe, National Association of Secondary School Principals

- Include results across the entire distribution of students and eliminate the use of a single cut-point.

  Parris Battle, Richard A. Boyd, and Michael Glode, National Assessment Governing Board

- Break down data by gender as well as race and ethnicity.

  Pamela Hugher, American Association of University Women

- Use the NCES standard when reporting change data. Attend to the metric used for this purpose.

  Barbara Schneider, National Opinion Research Center

- Add state-specific citizenship data to Part III of the Report such as percent of students taking civics, and voter registration data.

  Henry J. Hector, Alabama Commission on Higher Education

- Include more information on special education and be sensitive to the appropriateness of standards for special populations.

  Herb Salinger, American Association of School Personnel Administrators

- Reconsider the use of the Goal 1 indicators "parent-child cultural outings," "preschool quality," and "teacher preparation." The first indicator is biased against low SES and minority parents, the second does not accurately reflect program quality, and the last gives too much credit to minimum teacher preparation for the preschool classroom. Use the percentage of children living in poverty or the percentage fully immunized as other indices of readiness.

  Lana Hostetler and Marilyn Smith, National Association for Education of Young Children

- Consider the issues of linguistic and cultural diversity and the possibility of alternative assessments to account for this diversity.

  Eugene E. Garcia, National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning

- Include data on Native Americans under Goal 2.

  James B. Appleberry, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

- Include more information under Goal 3 about the preparation of students as productive workers.

  William E. Brock, U.S. Department of Labor

- Explicitly delineate the controversy surrounding international mathematics and science data comparisons.

  James W. Keefe, National Association of Secondary School Principals

- Include data from South America, the Mid-East, Asia and Africa to develop a more multicultural perspective and allow for more comparisons.

  James B. Appleberry, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

- Consider using high school completion data from other countries for comparisons under Goal 2.

  Ernest N. Mannino, U.S. Department of State

- Include migrant students in data collection and reporting.

  Ronnie E. Glover, National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education
  Carol Pedas Whitten, National Commission on Migrant Education

- Supplement the Advanced Placement and NAEP scores under Goal 3 with SAT information. Inform the reader that nonequivalent units have been added, e.g., semester and year-long courses.

  Donold M. Stewart, The College Board

- Add information on math and science education majors.

  Nancy Bunnett, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
  John McIntyre, Association of Teacher Educators
  David Imig, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

- Use census data to describe the level of education attainment under Goal 5.

  Barbara Brauner Berns, Massachusetts Department of Education

Federal Role Chapter Suggestions

- Use budget outlays rather than budget authority figures in the Federal Role chapter to more accurately estimate the federal contribution. Do not mix funding sources.

  Tom Shannon, National School Boards Association
  Wayne Riddle, Congressional Research Service

- Provide information on program eligibility and coverage as well as state and local contributions to add context to the Federal Role data.

  Wayne Riddle, Congressional Research Service
  Jay Noell, Congressional Budget Office

- Broaden the description of the Federal Role beyond the federal financial contribution.

  Susan Fuhrman, Rutgers University
  Chester E. Finn, Vanderbilt University
  Wayne Riddle, Congressional Research Service

- Fold nonfiscal information such as the discussion of mandates and flexibility into a broader background section on the Federal Role and give details only about programs and research and development.

  Susan Fuhrman, Rutgers University

- Report the federal contribution by goals rather than on broad schooling levels.

  Chester E. Finn, Vanderbilt University
  Marshall S. Smith, Stanford University
  Samuel B. Nunez, Jr. Senate, State of Louisiana

- Highlight the corporate contribution to education efforts in the United States.

  Daniel J. Kihano, House of Representatives, State of Hawaii

- Put context into the Federal Role by reporting outcome data when available.

  Chester E. Finn, Vanderbilt University

- Include information on the progress states are making in achieving systemic reform.

  Christopher Cross, The Business Roundtable

- Report outcome data where available.

  Chester E. Finn, Vanderbilt University

- Add more data points. For example, use four additional points before 1989 (1970, 1975, 1980, 1985) to provide trend data.

  Marshall S. Smith, Stanford University
  Wayne Riddle, Congressional Research Service

- Create a task force to guide the next effort, develop effectiveness indicators, and relate federal indicators to state level outcomes.

  P. Michael Timpane, Teachers College, Columbia University

Other Suggestions

- Provide evidence that national policymakers are acting on the Goals. This evidence could be legislation or funding support for the Goals or policies and programs that address the Goals.

  Kellet I. Min, Hawaii Department of Education

- Expand the distribution of the Report in some form to every school in the nation and provide every key policymaker with a copy of the Report and/or the executive summary.

  Alvin Trivelpiece, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

- Review the suggestions for data collection contained in the National Center for Education Statistics' "Education Counts."

  Joseph A. Spagnolo, Jr., Virginia Department of Public Instruction

- Ask selected schools (via sampling techniques) to react to the National Goals and include parents' input as well.

  Gerald C. Odland, Association for Childhood Education International

APPENDIX A

Press Articles

The following selective list of newspaper articles about the 1991 Goals Report was compiled from Panel Office records and through a search of newspaper databases. The headlines suggest the message conveyed by the press account.

The Anchorage Times – September 8, 1991
SOME SAY EDUCATION GOALS LEAVE OUT NATION'S CHILDREN
By: David Sarasohn

Arizona Republic – October 1, 1991
SCHOOL REPORTS GLOOMY U.S. GOALS FOR 2000 UNLIKELY TO BE FULFILLED
By: Tamara Henry

Atlanta Constitution – October 1, 1991
U.S. SCHOOLING CALLED SECOND-RATE; EMBARRASSING REPORT MAY INSPIRE ACTION, GEORGIA ANALYST SAYS
By: Betsy White

Atlanta Journal – September 30, 1991
REPORT: U.S. EDUCATION NOT IMPROVING FAST ENOUGH TO MEET GOALS SET FOR 2000
By: Betsy White

Atlanta Journal – September 30, 1991
EDUCATIONAL GOALS: A REPORT CARD
By: Staff

Austin American Statesman – October 1, 1991
By: Editorial

Baltimore Sun – October 3, 1991
SCHOOLS IN TROUBLE AGAIN
By: Editorial

Baltimore Evening Sun – September 30, 1991
NATION'S SCHOOLS FOUND WANTING OVER PAST 20 YEARS; THREE REPORTS SHOW SOME GAINS BUT MANY WEAKNESSES
By: From wire services

Baltimore Morning Sun – October 1, 1991
U.S. PUPILS TRAIL WORLD, REPORT SAYS; SCHOOL, GOALS PANEL SOUNDS WARNING
By: Mary Ann Roser

Baltimore Morning Sun – October 1, 1991
REPORT CARD RESULTS ARE MIXED FOR MARYLAND MATH: SKILLS LOW, BUT TEST SCORES GAIN
By: Gelareh Asayesh

Boston Globe – October 1, 1991
By: Muriel Cohen

Charlotte Observer – October 1, 1991
REPORTS GRIM: U.S. STUDENTS CAN'T COMPETE
By: Mary Ann Roser

Chicago Tribune – October 1, 1991
REPORT: U.S. SCHOOLS STUCK AT 1970s LEVEL
By: Elaine S. Povich

Chicago Tribune – October 3, 1991
WISCONSIN TEENS RANK 2nd IN ALCOHOL POLL
By: Chicago Tribune wires

Chicago Tribune – October 7, 1991
PROGRAMS TO ENSURE EARLY LEARNING MERIT TOP PRIORITY
By: Joan Beck

The Christian Science Monitor – October 1, 1991
EDUCATIONAL REPORT CARD GRIM – BUT IMPROVING
By: Clara Germani

The Christian Science Monitor – October 3, 1991
BACK TO THE CLASSROOM
By: Staff

Columbus Dispatch – October 1, 1991
NATION'S SCHOOLS ARE FAR FROM THEIR GOALS; WOINOVICH SAYS UPGRADING CANNOT WAIT
By: Roger K. Lowe and Mary Yost

Daily News of Los Angeles – October 1, 1991
STATE CITES BETTER SCORES, LOWER DROPOUT RATE
By: Cheryl W. Thompson

Daily News of Los Angeles – October 6, 1991
SOCIETAL WOES BOG DOWN GOALS FOR EDUCATION
By: Susan Chira

Detroit Free Press – October 1, 1991
REPORT CARD SHOWS U.S. FLUNKING; LITTLE PROGRESS MADE TOWARD EDUCATION GOALS
By: Lee Mitgang

Detroit Free Press – October 1, 1991
U.S. 'OFF MARK' ON SCHOOL GOALS; 'URGENT INTERVENTION' NEEDED TO REACH TARGETS
By: Staff

Detroit Free Press – October 8, 1991
FROM PRESCHOOL TO GRADUATE SCHOOL, BUSH MUST COMMIT MORE DOLLARS
By: Coretta Scott King

Education Daily – October 4, 1991
REFORM LEADERS PRAISE GOALS PANEL'S FIRST REPORT
By: Staff

Education Daily – October 30, 1991
By: Staff

Education Week – October 2, 1991
PLAIN-SPEAKING AND FAST-LEARNING, ROMER RIDES HERD ON THE GOALS PROCESS
By: Lynn Olson

Education Week – October 9, 1991
DATA, STRATEGY SAID MISSING IN REPORT ON GOALS
By: Lynn Olson and Robert Rothman

Education Week – October 9, 1991
ON HEELS OF NATIONAL REPORT ON GOALS, GOVERNORS OUTLINE PROGRESS OF STATES
By: Robert Rothman

The Hartford Courant – October 3, 1991
STUDENTS IN STATE LAG BEHIND NATION'S GOALS
By: Staff

Los Angeles Times – October 1, 1991
TWO PANELS CITE SOME IMPROVEMENTS IN MATH AND SCIENCE ABILITIES; SECRETARY ALEXANDER STILL SEES 'SHOCKING GAP' IN TRAINING FOR '90s
By: Paul Richter

Los Angeles Times – October 1, 1991
GOOD, BAD FOUND IN EDUCATION REPORTS
By: Jean Merl

The Miami Herald – September 29, 1991
BELEAGUERED SCHOOLS LIKELY TO FLUNK REPORT ON EDUCATION REFORM
By: Mary Ann Roser, Brian Baron and Maria Douglas

National Journal – October 5, 1991
IT'S MAGIC
By: Rochelle L. Stanfield

New Orleans Times–Picayune – October 1, 1991
REPORT CARD ON SCHOOLS IS DISMAL
By: Lee Mitgang

The New York Daily News – October 7, 1991
AMERICAN EDUCATION: FLUNKING OUT...
By: Staff

The New York Times – October 1, 1991
FIRST REPORT CARD ISSUED ON U.S. EDUCATION GOALS
By: Karen De Witt

The New York Times – October 2, 1991
REPORT CARD ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS: AT THIS RATE, THE NATION IS FLUNKING
By: Susan Chira

Orlando Sentinel – October 2, 1991
EDUCATION: THE PRIZE THAT IMMIGRANTS COVET, AMERICANS IGNORE
By: Myriam Marquez

Palm Beach Post - October 6, 1991
SOCIAL PROBLEMS DOWNPLAYED IN SCHOOL REPORT, CRITICS SAY
By: Susan Chira

Philadelphia Inquirer - October 1, 1991
SOME HOPEFUL NEWS ABOUT EDUCATION, BUT NOT IN MATH, SCIENCE
By: Mary Ann Roser

Phoenix Gazette - September 30, 1991
GRADING EDUCATION: BETTER, BUT NOT GOOD ENOUGH
By: Tamara Henry

Phoenix Gazette - October 2, 1991
ABCs OF FAILURE: YET ANOTHER DISMAYING REPORT
By: Staff

The Pittsburgh Press - September 28, 1991
CASEY EVALUATES STATE OF EDUCATION IN SCHOOL VISIT
By: Bill Zlatos

The Pittsburgh Press - October 8, 1991
WHEN IT COMES TO EDUCATION, POLITICIANS HAVE LOT TO LEARN
By: Joan Beck

Richmond Times-Dispatch - October 6, 1991
MODELS OF SCHOOL REFORM
By: Staff

Rocky Mountain News - October 1, 1991
EDUCATION REPORT CARD GIVES COLORADO ONLY C+; STILL, 66% OF STATE'S STUDENTS REACH OR PASS BASIC SKILLS, COMPARED TO ONLY 58% NATIONALLY
By: Katie Kerwin

Rocky Mountain News - October 17, 1991
HOW COLORADO RATES
By: Staff

Sacramento Bee - October 1, 1991
CALIFORNIA STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IMPROVING
By: Ricci R. Graham

St. Louis Dispatch - September 30, 1991
TAKING A PASS: MISSOURI CAN'T SAY HOW SCHOOLS ARE DOING
By: Staff

St. Louis Dispatch - October 3, 1991
THE EDUCATION GAP
By: Editorial

St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch - October 8, 1991
GOAL-SETTERS DON'T SEEM TO KNOW EDUCATION; CHILD'S LEARNING STARTS PRACTICALLY AT BIRTH
By: Joan Beck

The San Francisco Chronicle - October 1, 1991
STATE DROPOUT RATE FELL FROM 1986-90
By: Staff

Seattle Times - September 30, 1991
REPORT: STATE SCHOOLS FALLING SHORT OF GOALS
By: Paula Bock

Star Tribune - October 1, 1991
MINNESOTA SCHOOLS COMPARE FAVORABLY WITH REST OF U.S.
By: Mary Jane Smetanka

Star Tribune - October 1, 1991
'GOALS' REPORT CARD: PROGRESS FALLS SHORT
By: Staff

Sun Sentinel - October 1, 1991
OFFICIALS BLAME BUDGET FOR SCHOOLS' BAD GRADES
By: John Gittelsohn

USA Today - September 30, 1991
HOW GOOD IS GOOD ENOUGH?
By: Staff

USA Today - October 1, 1991
MORE FOCUS NEEDED ON DRUGS, READINESS: GEIGER
By: Wendy Benedetto

USA Today – October 1, 1991
NATION'S EDUCATION GOALS: A PROGRESS REPORT
By: Staff

USA Today – October 4, 1991
WHY NOT LET TEACHERS REALLY TEACH?
By: Joe Urschel

The Washington Post – September 30, 1991
PUPILS IN AMERICA REVERSE DECLINES, ANALYSIS SHOWS
By: Karen De Witt

The Washington Post – October 1, 1991
EDUCATION GOALS CALLED FAR FROM REALIZATION: REPORT WILL SERVE AS BASE LINE FOR PROGRESS
By: Kenneth J. Cooper

The Washington Post – October 1, 1991
NEW REPORT CARD
By: Staff

The Washington Times – October 1, 1991
THE FEDS FLUNK
By: Staff

The Washington Times – October 12, 1991
By: Leonard Larsen

APPENDIX B

Acknowledgments

The Goals Panel wishes to thank all the organizations and individuals listed below for their comments on the 1991 Goals Report.

ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama Commission on Higher Education
Henry J. Hector

American Association for Adult and Continuing Education
Drew Allbritten

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
David Imig

American Association of School Personnel Administrators
Herb Salinger

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
James B. Appleberry

American Association of University Women
Pamela Hugher

American Federation of Teachers
Albert Shanker

Aurora High School, Ohio
Linda Robertson

Association for Childhood Education International
Gerald C. Odland

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Gordon Cawelti

Association of Teacher Educators
John McIntyre

Ball State University School of Music
Joseph R. Scagnoli

Biloxi Public Schools, Mississippi
Jude Lupinetti

Board of the Metropolitan Education Association, Maryland
Whitty Cuninggim

The Business Roundtable
Christopher Cross

The Carnegie Commission*
David Z. Robinson

Carnegie Mellon University
G. Richard Tucker

Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education
Robert L. Martin

The College Board
Irene Spero
Donald M. Stewart

Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Public Instruction
Joseph A. Spagnolo, Jr.

Commonwealth of Virginia
The Governor's Office
Governor Lawrence Douglas Wilder

Congressional Budget Office*
Jay Noell

Congressional Research Service*
Wayne Riddle

Council for Advancement and Support of Education
Peter Buchanan

Garrison Public Schools, North Dakota
Hycj Schlieve

Good Sheperd School, Garland, Texas
Joan Koesling

State of Hawaii
Department of Education
Kellet I. Min

State of Hawaii
House of Representatives, Speaker's Office
The Sixteenth Legislature
Daniel J. Kihano

Lauren Rogers Museum of Arts, Laurel, Mississippi
Mary Anne Pennington

State of Louisiana
Senate
Samuel B. Nunez, Jr.

Lower Merion School District, Pennsylvania
Cecile P. Frey

State of Maine
House of Representatives, Speaker's Office
John L. Martin

State of Massachusetts
Department of Education
Barbara Brauner Berns

Mineola Union Free School District, New York
Marjorie D. Kubat

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
Nancy Bunnett

National Academy of Sciences
Board of International Comparative Studies in Education
Dorothy Gilford

National Alliance of Business
William H. Kolberg

National Assessment Governing Board
Parris Battle
Richard A. Boyd
Michael Glode

National Association for the Education of Young Children
Lana Hostetler
Marilyn Smith

National Association of Secondary School Principals
James W. Keefe

National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education
Ronnie E. Glover

National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning
Eugene E. Garcia

National Commission on Migrant Education
Carol Pedas Whitten

National Education Association
Debra DeLee

National Forum on Education Statistics
Kevin Crowe

National Opinion Research Center
Barbara Schneider

National School Boards Association
Tom Shannon

National Science Foundation
Walter E. Massey

National Staff Development Council
Dennis Sparks

New Hampshire State Council on the Arts
Lanie Keystone

Newport Preschool Center, New Hampshire
Karen Dewey

Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Alvin Trivelpiece

Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.
Carol O'Connell
Lowell C. Rose

Queens College, CUNY
Elliott Mendelson

Rutgers University*
Consortium for Policy Research in Education
Susan Fuhrman

Stanford University*
Marshall S. Smith

Teachers College, Columbia University*
P. Michael Timpane

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
Susan Bayley

State of Tennessee
Department of Education
Charles E. Smith

Texas Art Education Association
Cindy Broderick

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Harry C. Mussman

U.S. Department of Labor
The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills
William E. Brock

U.S. Department of State
Office of Overseas Schools
Ernest N. Mannino

University of Idaho Lionel Hampton School of Music
Lynn J. Skinner

University of the District of Columbia
Tilden J. LeMelle

Vanderbilt University*
Chester E. Finn

Western Nevada Community College
Anthony Calabro

* Federal Role Chapter reviewer.

INDIVIDUALS

Alan R. Campbell
Newport, Maine

Mitch Dantzler
Bossier City, Louisiana

Alice Dewittie
Portland, Oregon

Elma Mae Henderson
Yucaipa, California

John Hunter
New Windsor, New York

David Loertscher
Englewood, Colorado

Philip D. Parker
Russellville, Arkansas

Cynthia Parsons
Chester, Vermont

Paula M. Peterson
Germantown, Tennessee

Terry Peterson
Columbia, South Carolina

Gail Stephenson
Mount Pleasant, Michigan

Mary Tidwell
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Juanita Y. Van Hove
Portland, Oregon

Andrew Weiszman
Chicago, Illinois

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
STAFF MEMBERS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Wilmer S. Cody

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

Martin E. Orland

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Nancy Delasos
Edward Fuentes
Laura Lancaster
Leslie Lawrence
Cynthia Prince
Charles J. Walter
Emily Wurtz

with Carol Jay Stratoudakis

SUPPORT STAFF

Tia Cosey
Edna Wilson

1850 M Street, NW Suite 270 Washington, DC 20036
(202) 632-0952 FAX (202) 632-0957